UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,371	04/25/2001	Diane C. Breidenbach		6561
Thomas A. O'R	7590 09/14/201 ourke	EXAMINER		
BODNER & O'ROURKE			NGUYEN, TUAN N	
425 Broadhollow Road Melville, NY 11747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/14/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/842,371	BREIDENBACH ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Tuan N. Nguyen	3751			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ju	ılv 2010				
•		action is non-final.				
· · · · ·	<i>,</i> —					
٠,٣	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27,29,32-49,51,52 and 55-64</u> is/are pending in the application.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>32-39,51,56 and 62-64</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
· —	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27,29,40-49,52,55 and 57-61</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
•	on Papers	·				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2010 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
10)[_ · · · · - ·	•			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
3) 🔲 Inforn	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/842,371 Page 2

Art Unit: 3751

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/12/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to applicant's argument against the new matter of claim 57, nowhere in the original specification that recites the equivalent between the languages "shaft" is equivalent of "cantilevered rod." Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed 7/12/10 has added claims 62-64; however, these claims are directed toward a non-elected species. Therefore, claims 62-64 are hereby withdrawn from further consideration.

Drawings

3. Figure 16 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Application/Control Number: 09/842,371 Page 3

Art Unit: 3751

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 57-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. While the original specification discusses the roller ball having a surface roughness depending on the consistency of the product to be dispensed, nowhere does it teaches the "cantilevered rod" in line 2 of claim 57 is also considered as new matter since it is not presented in the original specification. The claims are being examined as best understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1-27, 29, 40-49, 52, 55 and 57-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,897,626 (hereinafter Bratby-Carey) in view of US Patent 2,663,891 (hereinafter Hanryon) and US Patent 6,276,856 (hereinafter Pieper) as set forth in the previous office action.

The added language of "said first roller ball having a surface roughness calibrated for optimal delivery of said product, said surface roughness being determined according to said product's viscosity" is considered as mere manufacturing calculation.

Application/Control Number: 09/842,371 Page 4

Art Unit: 3751

Every single, workable, rollerball applicator would obviously have a roller ball having a surface roughness calibrated for optimal delivery of the product since they are manufactured to dispense the liquid product of a device wherein the liquid product would obviously have a viscosity.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (10:00-6:00).

Art Unit: 3751

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (571) 272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tuan N Nguyen/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3751

ΤN